UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/777,158	02/05/2001	Laura Lee Menke	ROC920000259	2404

7590 06/17/2005

Gero G. McClellan
Thomason, Moser & Patterson, L.L.P.
Suite 1500
3040 Post Oak Boulevard
Houston, TX 77056-6582

EXAMINER	
SHORTLEDGE, THOMAS E	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2654	

DATE MAILED: 06/17/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/777,158	MENKE, LAURA LEE	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Thomas E. Shortledge	2654	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *18 January 2005*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,3-5,7-9,11-18,21,22,24-35,37,40,41 and 43-45* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,3-5,7-9,11-18,21,22,24-35,37,40,41 and 43-45* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *18 January 2005* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communication: Amendment received 01/18/2005.

2. Claims 1, 3-5, 7-9, 11-18, 21-22, 24-35, 37, 40-41, 43-46 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 3-5, 12-13, 16-18, 22, 24-25, 27, 29-32, 35, 37, 41 and 43 have been amended. Claims 2, 6, 10, 19-20, 23, 36, 38-39, and 42 have been cancelled. New Claims 45-46 have been added to recite aspects of the invention.

3. The objection to the disclosure has been withdrawn in light of Applicant's amendment.

4. The objection of claims 2, 6, 8, 13, 17, 19, 20, 23, 27, 29, 32, 38, 39, 42, and 43 have been withdrawn.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1-44 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

7. Claims 1, 3-5, 7-9, 11-18, 21-22, 24-35, 37, 40-41, and 43-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lakritz (6,623,529)

As to claims 1 and 22, Lakritz teaches:

associating a predefined parameter (placeholders) with an element in a source web page to be translated, wherein the predefined parameter comprises an attribute for the element in the source web page (a template contains placeholders for country and language-specific information that has been removed from a document, this information is dynamically inserted from a TermDB, another template or document when the composite document is presented to the browser, col. 26, lines 20-25);

inserting an entry containing translations of content for the element into an indexable dictionary file, wherein the entry is indexed in the dictionary file using a value associated with the attribute (tailoring a document for a specific language or country, where an entry is made into the document, replacing the placeholder with language-specific information from a TermDB, another template or a document, col. 26, lines 19-25); and

wherein a dictionary driven stylesheet may be applied to the source web page to generate a target web page containing the element and a translation of the content, the translation having been retrieved from the entry in the indexable dictionary file (applying

a TermDB (term database) or another template or document to insert country or language-specific information into a document template replacing the placeholder, col. 26, lines 20-25).

As to claim 12, Lakritz teaches:

inserting a predetermined parameter into a source code of the electronic document, the predetermined parameter indicating that an associated portion of text is to be translated (creating a template of a document by removing as much country and language-specific information, and replacing this information with placeholders represented by WebPlexer tags and commands, col. 26, lines 30-35);

inserting an entry representing a translation of the associated portion of text into an electronic dictionary file, wherein the entry in the electronic dictionary file is indexed using a value associated with the predetermined parameter (replacing the placeholders representing country and language-specific information, with a translation dynamically inserted from a TermDB, another template, or document, col. 26, lines 20-25); and

applying a dictionary driven generic stylesheet to the electronic documents in order to retrieve the translation of the associated portion of text (a TermDB glossary template used for applying the language-specific information where the placeholders are found, col. 26, lines 20-25 and col. 30, lines 62-63).

As to claim 31, Lakritz teaches:

inserting a predetermined parameter into a source code of the electronic document, the predetermined parameter indicating that an associated portion of text is to be translated and, wherein the predefined parameter comprises an attribute for a markup element in the source code that contains the text (creating a template of a document by removing as much country and language-specific information, and replacing this information with placeholders represented by WebPlexer tags and commands, where each tag represents a different action to take, col. 26, lines 30-35, col. 30, lines 45-59);

inserting an entry representing a translation of the associated portion of text into an electronic dictionary file, wherein the entry in the electronic dictionary file is indexed using a value associated with the predetermined parameter (replacing the placeholders representing country and language-specific information, with a translation dynamically inserted from a TermDB, another template, or document, col. 26, lines 20-25); and

applying a dictionary driven generic stylesheet to the electronic documents in order to retrieve the translation of the associated portion of text (a TermDB glossary template used for applying the language-specific information where the placeholders are found, col. 26, lines 20-25 and col. 30, lines 62-63).

As to claim 41, Lakritz teaches:

determine at least one portion of text in a source document having the predetermined parameter associated therewith, wherein the predefined parameter comprises an attribute for a markup element in the source web page that contains the

content (finding the placeholder with the tags indicating which text to replace, where the placeholder indicates which text strings needs to be replaced, col. 31, lines 1-30);

search in an electronic dictionary file to find root entry corresponding to a value associated with the predetermined parameter (searching a term to be replaced within a TermDB, col. 30, lines 64-67);

search in sub-root entries of the electronic dictionary to find an entry corresponding to the portion of text to be translated (searching the database for the word to translated and those words linked to it, col. 29, lines 14-18, and 34-42); and

search in children of the sub-root entries in the electronic dictionary to find a translation entry for textural content (searching the database for the correct word in the correct language for the translation, col. 29, lines 14-18, 34-42, and col. 31, lines 16-23).

As to claim 45, Lakritz teaches:

receiving the request to view the web page, wherein each element in the web page to be internationalized include a predetermined attribute and a key value (mechanism for automatic content insertion and delivery to web site visitors, where place holders are used to indicate content to be translated and inserted, col. 3, lines 30-34, and col. 26, lines 20-25);

determining a desired language for text content for the element (determining the language for translation, col. 31, lines 18-23);

identifying an indexable dictionary file comprising a plurality of entries, each including at least a version of the text content in a human-readable language (a TermDB is used for converting the text to the correct language, col. 29, lines 34-42); and

transforming the web page into a transformed webpage by applying an extensible stylesheet language transformation to the web page, wherein the stylesheet transformation is configured to determine, from the key value for a particular element, an entry in the indexable dictionary file, and wherein the stylesheet transformation is further configured to insert, into the particular element, the version of the text content, corresponding to the desired language (the WPRepalce function replaces a string with its translation, the string to be replaced and the currently selected language are sued as search keys within a TermDB, the TermDB is accessed and returns the translation of the string in the specified language, col. 30, lines 61-67).

As to claims 3 and 22, Lakritz teaches:

locating a root entry in the dictionary file (replacing a text string wit its translation from a TermDB, where the TermDB is searched first by current language, col. 30, lines 46-47, and col. 31 lines 16-24);

inserting a sub-root entry corresponding to the content to be translated, wherein the sub-root further corresponds to the value associated with the attribute (adding new TermString entries to the master language in the TermDB, col. 29, lines 62-64); and

inserting at least one translation of the content as a child entry of the sub-root entry, (inserting corresponding text strings in the target languages, col. 29, lines 62-64).

As to claim 4, Lakrtiz teaches:

locating textual content having the predefined parameter associated therewith in the source web page (locating the text string with the WPReplace tags, col. 30, line 62 through col. 31, line 23);

indexing in the dictionary file to find a root entry corresponding to the attribute associated with the predefined parameter (the TermDB is searched first based on the language of the content to be replaced, col. 31, lines 11-24); and

indexing into children of the root entry to find a translation entry for textual content (finding the translation term matching the target language, and content of the original term, col. 31, lines 11-24).

As to claim 5, Lakrtiz teaches:

determining a target language (determining the target language, col. 31, lines 18-24); and

indexing into the children of the root entry to find a particular child entry corresponding to the target language (finding the term matching the target language, col. 31, lines 11-24).

As to claims 7 and 28, Lakritz teaches:

generating the indexable dictionary file with a markup language (building a TermDB for us with HTML files, col. 28, lines 25-60); and

generating the generic dictionary driven stylesheet with a markup language (generating document templates representing electronic document viewable by a browser, col. 26, lines 20-25).

As to claims 8 and 29, Lakritz teaches the indexable dictionary file further comprises at least one root element at least one sub-root element corresponding to the value associated with the attribute, and at least one child if the sub-root element corresponding to an available human language translation for the content (a TermDB includes listings first by language, and content of first language, then has listing for translations into target languages, col. 29, lines 34-43).

As to claims 9 and 30, Lakritz teaches the dictionary driven stylesheet further comprises at least one template match operation configured to copy all untouched noted from a source document to a destination document, and at least one template match statement configured to translate text in the source document via access into the indexable dictionary file (a template with placeholders for translation, where as much of all the language-specific information is removed, the remaining information is copied to the next document, where the language-specific information that is removed, is translated when the document is displayed within the browser, col. 26, lines 20-30).

As to claim 11, Lakritz teaches:

the stylesheet further comprises a generic dictionary driven stylesheet that may be reused for various applications (the template-based approach to dynamically create document tailored for a specific language or country can be used for any document, col. 26, lines 17-19).

As to claims 13 and 32, Lakritz teaches:

determining what portions of text are to be translated in the source code of the electronic document (removing as much country and language-specific information as possible from a document, col. 26, lines 26-29); and

associating the predetermined parameter with the portions of text determined to be translated in the source document, the predetermined parameter identifying the value associated with the predetermined parameter (a placeholder is placed where ever information is language and country information is removed, the place hold denoting information to be translated, col. 26, lines 19-25).

As to claims 14 and 33, Lakrtiz teaches the source code further comprises a markup language code set (translating web sites, col. 3, lines 29-31).

As to claims 15 and 34, Lakrtiz teaches the markup language code set further comprises at least one of a hypertext language code set, (col. 4, lines 20-21).

As to claims 16 and 35, Lakrtiz teaches:

locating a root entry in the electronic dictionary file corresponding to the value associated with the predetermined parameter (locating the correct language of the string, col. 29, lines 34-42);

inserting a sub-root entry corresponding to the portion of text to be translated (finding the term within the language to be translated to, col. 29, lines 34-42, and col. 31, lines 5-10); and

inserting at least one sub-root child entry, wherein each sub-root child entry corresponds to a translation of the portion of text in a particular language (inserting the entry corresponding to the target language of the content to be translated, col. 31, lines 15-24).

As to claims 17 and 43, Lakrtiz teaches the locating step further comprises locating a root entry in the electronic dictionary file corresponding to value associated with the predetermined parameter for the portion of text to be translated (finding the master language and the target language of the content to be translated from and to, col. 31, lines 7-24).

As to claims 18 and 37, Lakrtiz teaches:

determining at least one portion of text in a source document having the predetermined parameter associated therewith finding the placeholder with the tags

indicating which text to replace, where the placeholder indicates which text strings needs to be replaced, col. 31, lines 1-30);

searching in the electronic dictionary file to find a root entry corresponding to the value associated with the predetermined parameter (searching the TermDB to find the master language corresponding to the content to be translated, col. 29, lines 34-41, and col. 31, lines 11-24);

searching in sub-root entries of the electronic dictionary to find an entry corresponding to the portion of text to be translated (searching the TermDB for the entry to be translated , col. 29, lines 34-41, and col. 31, lines 11-24); and

searching in children of the sub-root entries in the electronic dictionary to find a translation entry for the text to be translated (finding the translation term matching the target language, and content of the original term, col. 31, lines 11-24).

As to claims 21, 40, and 43, Lakritz teaches searching in children of the sub-root entries further comprise indexing into the children of the sub-root entries with a preferred language parameter to find a match (a target language is used to search the index to find the correct translation term, col. 31, lines 11-24).

As to claim 25, Lakritz teaches:

searching through the source web page to find textual content having the predefined parameter associated therewith (locating the text string with the WPReplace tags, col. 30, line 62 through col. 31, line 23);

indexing into the dictionary file to find a root entry corresponding to the value associated with the redefined parameter (the TermDB is searched first based on the language of the content to be replaced, col. 31, lines 11-24);

indexing into sub-root entries to find an entry corresponding to the textual content (searching the TermDB for the entry to be translated , col. 29, lines 34-41, and col. 31, lines 11-24); and

indexing into children of the sub-root entries to find a translation entry for textual content (finding the translation term matching the target language, and content of the original term, col. 31, lines 11-24).

As to claim 26, Lakritz teaches:

determining a target language (determining the target language, col. 31, lines 18-24); and

indexing into the children of the root entry to find a particular child entry corresponding to the target language (finding the term matching the target language, col. 31, lines 11-24).

As to claim 27, Lakritz teaches the step of indexing into the dictionary file further comprises indexing into the dictionary file to find a root entry that matches the value associated with the predetermined parameter (finding the master language and the target language of the content to be translated from and to, col. 31, lines 7-24).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claim 45 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lakritz as applied to claim 43 above, in further view of Raggett et al. (HTML 4.01 Specification)

As to claim 45, Lakritz teaches:

the webpage is composed from HTML elements (col. 4, lines 20-21);

a dictionary file, where in a first element indicates a particular key value, and wherein a sub-element of the first element indicates a version of the text content (a TempDB is searched to find elements relating to the translation of the selected content, first searching by language, then by term, col. 29, liens 34-42, and col. 31, lines 7-24).

Lakritz does not teach and XML document.

However, Raggett et al. teaches using XML stylesheets with HTML documents.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the localization process of Lakritz, with the XML documents of Raggett et al. to allow for a stylesheet to be linked to a group of pages, as taught by Raggett et al., (section 14.6).

Conclusion

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thomas E. Shortledge whose telephone number is (571)272-7612. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00 - 4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richemond Dorvil can be reached on (571)272-7602. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

TS
06/09/2005

RICHEMOND DORVIL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER